

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00023 051042Z

17

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 /089 W

----- 061806

O P 050925Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1400

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0023

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF
FEBRUARY 3, 1976

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE FEB 3 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE NETHERLANDS REP, UK REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV AND SHUSTOV (SMIRNOVSKY WILL NOT BE PRESENT IN VIENNA DURING THIS ROUND), POLISH REP DABROWA, AND CZECHOSLOVAK REP LAHODA. THE SESSION WAS SLOW MOVING, OWING IN PART TO THE PRESENCE OF A NEW SOVIET INTERPRETER, AND RATHER UNEVENTFUL.

2. AT THE OUTSET EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES AVOIDED DIRECT MENTION OF WESTERN NUCLEAR REDUCTION PROPOSAL. THEY FIRST URGED THAT THE WEST RECONSIDER ITS NEGATIVE POSITION ON THE EASTERN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00023 051042Z

INITIAL STEP AND FREEZE PROPOSALS. THEY THEN ENGGAGED IN

RESTRAINED CRITICISM OF THE EXPANDED WESTERN REDUCTION PROPOSAL ON THREE MAIN GROUNDS: (A) THAT IT WAS MADE DEPENDENT ON EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE OVERALL WESTERN REDUCTION APPROACH WHICH ENTAILED UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE FOR THE WEST; (B) THAT IT DID NOT COVER NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS OF REMAINING WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS; AND (C) THAT IT DID NOT PROVIDE FOR REDUCTION COMMITMENTS BY THE REMAINING WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. KHLESTOV ASKED ONLY TWO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL.

3. KHLESTOV GREETED PARTICIPANTS AND TURNED WORD OVER TO POLISH REP WHO DESCRIBED THE MERITS OF THE NOV 8, 1973 EASTERN PROPOSAL IN FAMILIAR TERMS. DABROWA STRESSED THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSALS FOR A FIRST STEP REDUCTION AND A FREEZE WERE STILL TOPICAL AND INVITED THE WEST TO RECONSIDER ITS NEGATIVE POSITION ON THEM.

4. UK REP PRESENTED REASONS WHY THE WEST CONSIDERED ITS AUGMENTED REDUCTION PROPOSAL A DECISIVE MOVE. CZECHOSLOVAK REP PRESENTED A GENERAL CRITIQUE OF THE WESTERN POSITION, CLAIMING THAT THE WEST WAS STILL ATTEMPTING TO CHANGE THE OVERALL RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN THE AREA IN ITS OWN FAVOR THROUGH DEMANDING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO NUMERICALLY ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS. HE CRITICIZED REFUSAL OF THE NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO DECLARE WHAT REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS THEY WERE READY TO ASSUME. ON THIS OCCASION, CZECHOSLOVAK REP DID NOT, AS EASTERN REPS ALMOST INVARIABLY DID IN THE LAST ROUND, EXPRESSLY CALL ON REMAINING NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO SPECIFY THE AMOUNT AND TIMING OF THEIR REDUCTIONS.

5. NETHERLANDS REP DEALT WITH EASTERN CRITICISMS OF THE AUGMENTED WESTERN REDUCTION APPROACH, SHOWING WHY THE EASTERN CONTENTION THAT THE WEST WOULD OBTAIN UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE WAS NOT JUSTIFIED. KHLESTOV SAID NUCLEAR REDUCTION PROPOSAL DID REPRESENT A CERTAIN DEGREE OF MOVEMENT BY THE WEST BUT ITS WEAKNESSES WERE THAT IT WAS DEPENDENT ON EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE ENTIRE WESTERN REDUCTION PROGRAM, INCLUDING THE WESTERN POSITION ON PHASING AND COLLECTIVE CEILINGS, AND THAT IT WOULD NOT COVER MEANS OF DELIVERY OF NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS OF NON-US WESTERN PARTICIPANTS. HE ASKED TO WHICH NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00023 051042Z

THE 1000 US WARHEADS WERE ASSIGNED AND CRITICIZED THE PROPOSAL FOR NOT PROVIDING FOR REDUCTION OF AIR FORCES, SAYING THAT IT WOULD EVEN PERMIT THEM TO INCREASE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES. THESE POINTS CAME AT THE END OF THE SESSION AND WESTERN REPS SAW NO NEED TO DEAL WITH THEM AT THAT STAGE.

6. US REP SAID EASTERN REMARKS THUS FAR SHOWED EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES DID NOT GRASP THE TRUE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE

AUGMENTED WESTERN PROPOSAL, WHICH MARKED A MAJOR CHANGE IN THE WESTERN POSITION. EASTERN CRITICISM ABOUT UNILATERAL WESTERN ADVANTAGE WAS BASELESS. FURTHER STUDY SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR TO EAST THAT THE ACTUAL WESTERN OBJECTIVE WAS TO MAKE AGREEMENT POSSIBLE. KHLESTOV RETORTED THAT AGREEMENT WOULD BE POSSIBLE IF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS UNDERTOOK CONCRETE AND EQUIVALENT OBLIGATIONS TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES AND WOULD AGREE THAT REDUCTIONS WOULD COVER ALL ARMED FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE, NOT ONLY THEIR PERSONNEL, BUT ALSO THEIR ARMAMENTS.

7. AT THE END OF THE SESSION, KHLESTOV ATTEMPTED TO GAIN ALLIED AGREEMENT THAT FUTURE INFORMAL SESSIONS WOULD DEAL ON AN ALTERNATING BASIS WITH GENERAL QUESTIONS AND DEFINITIONS. ALLIED REPS DECLINED. FINALLY, IT WAS AGREED THAT THE FORCE DEFINITION ISSUE WOULD BE HANDLED IN THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION AND THAT THE TWO ENSUING SESSIONS WOULD BE DEVOTED TO GENERAL QUESTIONS AND THAT A DECISION WOULD BE REACHED AT THE END OF THE THIRD SESSION AS TO WHAT THE FURTHER PLAN OF WORK SHOULD BE.

8. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE NEXT SESSION WILL BE HELD ON FEBRUARY 10. END SUMMARY.

REMAINDER OF REPORT SENT SEPTTEL.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL, EAST WEST MEETINGS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 FEB 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: saccheem
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00023
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760043-1131
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760279/aaaacrpm.tel
Line Count: 138
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: saccheem
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2004 by CollinP0>; APPROVED <28 JUL 2004 by saccheem>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF FEBRUARY 3, 1976
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006